

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
EASTERN DISTRICT OF WISCONSIN

SUSAN HAGEN,

Plaintiff,

Case No. 19-cv-1801-pp

v.

ANDREW M. SAUL,

Defendant.

**ORDER GRANTING PLAINTIFF'S MOTION FOR LEAVE TO PROCEED
WITHOUT PREPAYING THE FILING FEE (DKT. NO. 3)**

The plaintiff has filed a complaint seeking judicial review of a final administrative decision denying her claim for disability insurance benefits under the Social Security Act. Dkt. No. 1. She also filed a motion for leave to proceed without prepaying the filing fee. Dkt. No. 3.

To allow the plaintiff to proceed without paying the filing fee, the court first must decide whether the plaintiff can pay the fee; if not, it must determine whether the lawsuit is frivolous. 28 U.S.C. §§1915(a) and 1915(e)(2)(B)(i).

Based on the facts in the plaintiff's affidavit, the court concludes that she does not have the ability to pay the filing fee. The plaintiff's affidavit indicates that she is not employed, she is not married, and she has no dependents she is responsible for supporting. Dkt. No. 3 at 1. The plaintiff lists income of \$194 per month from Food Share and \$627 per month from Section 8 housing. Id. at 2. The monthly expenses listed by the plaintiff total \$841 (\$575 rent—paid by

Section 8, \$246 other household expenses—\$52 paid by Section 8, \$194 paid by Food Share). *Id.* The plaintiff owns a 2004 Toyota Camry worth approximately \$2,000, she does not own a home or any other property of value, and she has no cash on hand or in a checking or savings account. *Id.* at 3-4. In the other circumstances section of the affidavit, the plaintiff states, “I really need help because of my Health is not good. I need to support Myself with food, so I can buy Supplies, have gas for my car, oil changes. To buy clothes, just to be able to live.” *Id.* at 4. The plaintiff has demonstrated that she cannot pay the \$350 filing fee and \$50 administrative fee.

The next step is to determine whether the case is frivolous. A case is frivolous if there is no arguable basis for relief either in law or in fact. *Denton v. Hernandez*, 504 U.S. 25, 31 (1992) (quoting *Nietzke v. Williams*, 490 U.S. 319, 325 (1989); *Casteel v. Pieschek*, 3 F.3d 1050, 1056 (7th Cir. 1993)). A person may obtain district court review of a final decision of the Commissioner of Social Security. 42 U.S.C. §405(g). The district court must uphold the Commissioner’s final decision as long as the Commissioner used the correct legal standards and the decision is supported by substantial evidence. *See Roddy v. Astrue*, 705 F.3d 631, 636 (7th Cir. 2013).

The plaintiff’s complaint indicates that she was denied benefits by the Commissioner for lack of disability, that she is disabled, and that the conclusions and findings of fact by the Commissioner when denying benefits are not supported by substantial evidence and are contrary to law and regulation. Dkt. No. 1 at 1-2. At this early stage in the case, and based on the

information in the plaintiff's complaint, the court concludes that there may be a basis in law or in fact for the plaintiff's appeal of the Commissioner's decision, and that the appeal may have merit, as defined by 28 U.S.C. §1915(e)(2)(B)(i).

The court **GRANTS** the plaintiff's motion for leave to proceed without prepaying the filing fee. Dkt. No. 3.

Dated in Milwaukee, Wisconsin this 10th day of December, 2019.

BY THE COURT:



HON. PAMELA PEPPER
Chief United States District Judge